

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified patent application in view of the amendments above and the remarks following is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-88 are in this case. Claims 25, 34-37, 46-49, 58-61 and 70-80 have been rejected under § 102(e). Claims 26-31, 38-43, 50-55 and 62- 67 have been rejected under § 103(a). Claims 32, 33, 44, 45, 50-60, 62-72, 75, 76, 79 and 80 have been objected to. Claims 1-24 and 80-88 have been allowed. Claims 25, 31-33, 37, 43-45, 49, 55-57, 61 and 67-69 have been canceled. Dependent claims 26-30, 34-36, 38-42, 46-48, 50-54, 58-60, 62-66 and 70-80 have been amended.

The claims before the Examiner are directed toward methods and systems for resolving pointing ambiguities that arise when a user of a computer interface such as a GUI intends to point a pointer towards a targeted one of a plurality of objects. The user moves the pointer toward the targeted object. Because of the pointing ambiguities, the pointer also points towards at least one other object. The computer resolves the ambiguity implicitly by analyzing the user movements and predicting, using heuristic measures, which of the objects pointed to is the targeted object.

§ 102(b) Rejections – Tahara et al. ‘842

The Examiner has rejected claims 25, 34-37, 46-49, 58-61 and 70-80 under § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tahara et al., US Patent No. 6,362,842 (henceforth, “Tahara et al. ‘842”). The Examiner’s rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 25, 37, 49 and 61 now have been canceled, thereby rendering moot the Examiner’s rejection of these claims.

As discussed below, claims 34-36, 46-48, 58-60 and 70-80 have been placed in condition for allowance by being amended to depend from claims 81, 83, 85 and 87.

§ 103(a) Rejections – Tahara et al. ‘842 and Schmidt et al.

The Examiner has rejected claims 26-29, 31, 38-41, 43, 50-53, 55, 62-65 and 67 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tahara et al. ‘842 and Schmidt et al., “Motor-Output Variability: A Theory for the Accuracy of Rapid Motor Acts”, *Psychological Review* vol. 86 no. 5 pp 415-450 (September 1979). The Examiner’s rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed below, claims 26-29, 31, 38-41, 43, 50-53, 55, 62-65 and 67 have been placed in condition for allowance by being amended to depend from claims 81, 83, 85 and 87.

§ 103(a) Rejections – Tahara et al. ‘842 and MacKenzie.

The Examiner has rejected claims 30, 42, 54 and 66 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tahara et al. ‘842 and MacKenzie, “Movement time prediction in human-computer interfaces”, in Baecker et al., eds., *Readings in Human-Computer Interaction, 2nd Edition* (Kaufmann, 1995) pp. 483-493. The Examiner’s rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed below, claims 30, 42, 54 and 66 have been placed in condition for allowance by being amended to depend from claims 81, 83, 85 and 87.

Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 50-60, 62-72, 75, 76, 79 and 80 as reciting a “method” instead of a “system”.

Claims 55-57 and 67-69 now have been canceled, thereby rendering moot the Examiner’s objection to these claims. Claims 50-54, 58-60, 62-66, 70-72, 75, 76, 79 and 80 have been amended to recite a “system”.

The Examiner has objected to claims 32, 33, 44, 45, 56, 57, 68 and 69 as being based on rejected base claims. The Examiner has noted that claims 32, 33, 44, 45, 56, 57, 68 and 69 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

In the response to the Office Action mailed on November 5, 2003, claim 32 was rewritten in independent form as claim 81, claim 33 was rewritten in independent form as claim 82, claim 44 was rewritten in independent form as claim 83, claim 45 was rewritten in independent form as claim 84, claim 56 was rewritten in independent form as claim 85, claim 57 was rewritten in independent form as claim 86, claim 68 was rewritten in independent form as claim 87 and claim 69 was rewritten in independent form as claim 88. Therefore, claims 31-33, 43-45, 55-57 and 67-69 now have been canceled.

The base claim from which claim 32 originally depended was claim 25. Therefore, claims 26-30, 34-36, 73 and 77 now have been amended to depend from claim 81. Because claims 26-30 and 34 recite implicit user pointing gesture measures that are alternatives to the implicit user pointing gesture measures recited in claim 81, the word "also" has been added to claims 26-30 and 34.

The base claim from which claim 44 originally depended was claim 37. Therefore, claims 38-42, 46-48, 74 and 78 now have been amended to depend from claim 83. Because claims 38-42 and 46 recite implicit user pointing gesture measures that are alternatives to the implicit user pointing gesture measures recited in claim 83, the word "also" has been added to claims 38-42 and 46.


The base claim from which claim 56 originally depended was claim 49. Therefore, claims 50-54, 58-60, 75 and 79 now have been amended to depend from claim 85. Because claims 50-54 and 58 recite implicit user pointing gesture measures

that are alternatives to the implicit user pointing gesture measures recited in claim 85, the word "also" has been added to claims 50-54 and 58.

The base claim from which claim 68 originally depended was claim 61. Therefore, claims 62-66, 70-72, 76 and 80 now have been amended to depend from claim 87. Because claims 62-66 and 70 recite implicit user pointing gesture measures that are alternatives to the implicit user pointing gesture measures recited in claim 87, the word "also" has been added to claims 62-66 and 70.

In view of the above amendments and remarks it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 13 and 81-88, and hence dependent claims 2-12, 14-24, 26-30, 34-36, 38-42, 46-48, 50-54, 58-60, 62-66 and 70-80 are in condition for allowance. Prompt notice of allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark M. Friedman
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 33,883

Date: August 17, 2004